



333 EARLE OVINGTON BOULEVARD, SUITE 402  
 UNIONDALE, NEW YORK 11553  
 T: 516-203-7600  
 F: 516-282-7878

July 25, 2025

**Via ECF**

Hon. Arun Subramanian  
 United States District Judge  
 Southern District of New York  
 500 Pearl Street, Courtroom 15A  
 New York, NY 10007

Re: *Global Weather Productions, LLC v. Reuters News & Media, Inc., et al.*; 24-cv-7828 (AS)

Dear Judge Subramanian:

Plaintiff Global Weather Productions, LLC (“Plaintiff”), by and through its undersigned counsel, writes to respectfully provide the Court with an update on the consummation of the parties’ settlement, and, by virtue of the Court’s July 14, 2025 Order [Dkt. No 60] stating there would be no more extensions of the deadline to dismiss or re-open, Plaintiff respectfully requests to re-open the action by today’s deadline so as not to foreclose its ability to do so.

By way of background, on May 23, 2025, Defendants filed a Consent Letter Motion requesting an adjournment of the in-person settlement conference, sine die, or alternatively, for an extension of time [Dkt. No. 54] as the parties were close to reaching a settlement and were negotiating terms of an agreement. On May 27, 2025, the Court entered a conditional thirty (30) day Order of Dismissal [Dkt. No. 55]. On June 23, 2025, the Court granted the parties first request for an extension of time to dismiss or re-open the action by July 11, 2025 [Dkt. No. 58]. On July 14, 2025, the Court granted the parties second request for an extension of time to dismiss or re-open the action by July 25, 2025 which indicated “no more extensions” [Dkt. No. 60].

Though settlement has not been fully consummated, we are pleased to inform the Court that today, the parties have exchanged copies of the fully executed settlement agreement. However, the agreement provides the parties with fifteen (15) business days (August 15, 2025 at the latest) to perform their obligations thereunder, and certain terms are conditioned on the performance of these obligations including dismissal of the action with prejudice. Plaintiff does not wish to take up the Court’s time and re-open a matter close to final resolution, but submits this application to do so in an abundance of caution, unless, the Court finds the foregoing demonstrates good cause to grant the parties a final extension to August 15, 2025.

Defendants’ position on this application is: “The request to reopen should be denied. The Court’s Order of Dismissal contemplated reopening within a limited time period “if the settlement is not consummated.” Dkt. 55. As of today, the settlement agreement has been consummated (*i.e.*, executed). Therefore, there is no need or basis to reopen. In the alternative, the Court should extend the deadline to move to reopen to August 15, 2025, for the limited purpose of performing certain obligations under the executed agreement.”



We thank the Court for its time and consideration of this request.

Respectfully submitted,  
/s Renee J. Aragona  
Renee J. Aragona  
SANDERS LAW GROUP  
*Counsel for Plaintiff*